Pragmatic and Paradoxical Philanthropy: Tatas' Gift-Giving and Scientific Development in India

Despite the growing interest in contemporary Indian philanthropy and its potential contribution to development in the country (Bukhari, 2013; Kassam et al, 2016; Sundar, 2013), academic scholarship on the subject has remained thin (Sidel, 2001). The limited scholarly attention becomes more telling in light of the decline in incoming foreign aid to the country (as percentage of GNI; see Bukhari, 2013; World Bank, nd) despite the persistence of poverty and inequality, and the growing prominence and influence of philanthrocapitalism (Bishop and Green, 2008) across the globe. Within this limited corpus, disproportionate attention has been paid to outlining and arguing for a uniquely Indian tradition of philanthropy (see, e.g. Dadrawala's Foreword in Kassam et al, 2016; Sundar, 2013); and re-organizing it to improve its effectiveness (Blake et al, 2009). While the latter can be understood as part of the turn toward philanthrocapitalism, the former are no less problematic. Although historical in scope, such approaches are reductive and deeply problematic. Not only do they flatten significant conceptual distinctions (between charity, CSR, volunteerism, and venture philanthropy), they are marked by historical amnesia. In particular, they disregard the formative influence of imperialism in the modernization of Indian philanthropy, despite historiography on the subject suggesting otherwise (Haynes, 1987; Palsetia, 2003, 2005).

Moving past the (on-going) search for an Indian 'tradition' of philanthropy and calls for its re-organization, I interrogate the diverse influences that have shaped modern Indian philanthropy in the 'long' twentieth century in this article. It is drawn on the history of philanthropy of the house of Tatas, India's leading multinational corporate group (for an extended and historical discussion on Tatas, see Lala, 2004; Tripathi and Jumani, 2007; and Tripathi and Mehta, 2011). In particular, I focus on Tatas' philanthropy for scientific development: endowing research institutions, funding scientific training through scholarship and faculty exchange, and technological development. The decision to focus on scientific development is motivated by the recognition of its central role in

international development.[1] It is also an acknowledgement of the significant role of philanthropic foundations in scientific development in the country (see, e.g. Gordon, 1997; Hess, 2003; Staples, 1992 on US Foundations in India; and Kavadi, 2011, 2014 on Indian philanthropy and scientific development in the country). The choice of Tata Group over other Indian business groups' philanthropy is informed by the size, scope, and persistence of their philanthropy, starting from 1892 onward. At the same time, I also turn to extant scholarship on other philanthropic organizations (Indian philanthropic Trusts and US 'Big Three' Foundations; Parmar 2012) in the country by way of emplacing Tatas' philanthropy in their contemporary context.

I begin with a brief but considered review of extant scholarship on Indian philanthropy in the first section. My focus, here, is on organized voluntary giving and not individual volunteerism, voluntary association, or individual charity (Payton and Moody, 2008). Following which, I argue, that the shaping of modern Indian philanthropy has been narrated in one of the following three ways: as modernizing, managerial, and nationalist. Next, I present a history of Tatas' philanthropy for scientific development in post/colonial India. Departing from the straight-forward, singular, and smooth narratives, I argue in the third section that modern Indian philanthropy has been shaped variously by capitalism, imperialism, modernity, nationalism, religion, tradition, and more recently neoliberal globalization. The diverse and sometimes contradictory ways by which Indian philanthropy has been shaped can be understood, I propose, as pragmatic and paradoxical. This is followed by a brief conclusion.

INDIAN PHILANTHROPY: A STORY OF THREE NARRATIVES

[1] Starting from US President Truman's (1949) inaugural address, technology transfer came to be a powerful means of attaining international development in the 'Third World'. Such large-scale, science, technology and industry-centric imaginaries of international development, however, came under severe challenge from proponents of 'intermediate technology' (McRobie, 1979; Schumacher, 1973). Relatedly, modern science has also been criticized from below for its violent destruction of communities located in the 'Third World' and their knowledge systems (Alvares, 1992; Shiva, 1989). Likewise, the social sciences were also complicit in the production and organization of the 'Third World' (Pletsch, 1981; Wallerstein, 1997).

In their *India Philanthropy Report*, the leading global management consulting firm Bain & Co (2015) outlined that India had witnessed extensive growth in philanthropy, which put it far ahead of other countries with similar development indices. Noting this as a sign of maturity, its most recent report (2017) focussed on the rise of individual philanthropy in the country, which had now outpaced both in-coming funds from foreign sources and corporate social responsibility contributions in the country.[2] The significant growth and maturity of Indian philanthropy has led its proponents to characterise the present as 'exciting times' (Cantegreil et al, 2013: 16; Kassam et al, 2016). Despite the excitement, one of the recurring themes in contemporary scholarship has been the need for developing systematic approaches, professional management, and scientific impact assessment of Indian philanthropy. Indian philanthropy has been characterised as 'broken' (Blake et al, 2009), that is too fragmented, less organized, not secular enough given its continuities with 'traditional' forms of charity, and where decision making is based on impulse and social affiliations (Bain & Co, 2015; Bukhari, 2013; Mangaleswaran and Venkateswaran, nd). Calls for fixing Indian philanthropy, in turn, have called for increasing organization and managerialism to construct effective and high-impact philanthropy. In their *Million Dollar Donor Report*, Coutts & Co (2015), for example, have called for leadership and collaboration among Indian philanthropists to construct 'strategic' or 'upstream' philanthropy that tackles root causes of developmental problems. Others have called for systemic reform including state-sponsored regulatory incentives to encourage philanthropy, and systematic approaches to philanthropy including organized information, evidence-based decision making, and scientific impact measurement, among others (Bukhari, 2013; Inderfurth and Khambatta, 2012; Kassam et al, 2016; Mangaleswaran and Venkateswaran, nd).

Such calls are best conceptualized as an on-going managerial modernization of Indian philanthropy. As part of philanthrocapitalism, they seek to supplant values, approaches,

[2] CSR contributions were made mandatory following the enactment of the Companies Act, 2013. As per the Act, the Board of any company having a net worth in excess of INR five hundred crores, or turnover in excess of INR one thousand crores, or a net annual profit of INR five crores or more, must spend at least two per cent of the average net profits of the company on CSR activities. For more see: http://www.mca.gov.in/Ministry/pdf/CompaniesAct2013.pdf

and practices from the worlds of business and management to those of philanthropy and development (Edwards, 2008; Holmes, 2012; Ramdas, 2011). In so doing, proponents of managerial modernization of Indian philanthropy cite the example of large US Foundations, including the Carnegie, Ford, Rockefeller, and more recently Gates, which have approached philanthropy scientifically. More commonly associated with the 'Big Three' US Foundations from the first two decades of the twentieth century, 'scientific philanthropy' refers both to an organized, systematic, and scientific approach to philanthropy as well as to philanthropy for scientific development (Howe, 1980). Such a mimicry of the approaches and practices of US Foundations can be understood as part of the American 'soft power' (Nye, 1990).

While the narrative of managerial modernization is both recent and extensive, it is, I would argue, a part of a long-standing narrative of modernization of Indian philanthropy initiated in the seventeenth century onward. The modernization of 'traditional', disorganized charity has been shaped, in no small measure, by colonialism and imperialism (Haynes, 1987; Palsetia, 2003, 2005; White, 1991). The Parsis – a small, prosperous, and largely Anglophile community from India, to which the Tatas belonged – have been known to put their philanthropy to strategic use (Desai, 1968; Karaka, 1884; Luhrmann, 1996; Palsetia, 2003; White, 1991). From building community infrastructure in the city in eighteenth century (White, 1991), Parsi philanthropy gradually gravitated toward that which mirrored the values and ethos of the imperial elites (Haynes, 1987; Palsetia, 2003, 2005). It was part of Parsi, but also other Indian business communities', attempts at signalling and developing proximity with the ruling elite in the eighteenth century.

In his excellent history of philanthropy in the mercantile city of Surat from the 17th-19th centuries, Haynes (1987) has argued that with the emergence of the colonial bureaucracy, gifts in the form of tribute made to the ruling elite were rendered illegal. Civic-orientated, secular, and 'modern' philanthropic gifts, however, were perceived favourably by the colonial bureaucrats. They signalled the Indian elites' concern for the masses and their commitment to reform to the ruling elites. The contemporary philanthropists, therefore, modified their gifts to align them with the 'imperial elite's

political idiom' (Haynes, 1987: 357). Similarly and specific to the Parsi community from nineteenth century Bombay, Palsetia (2005) has argued that philanthropy provided the means through which Parsi elites sought to create a collaborative political community in which they had a significant role to play. He concludes: '[t]he transition to British power compelled and motivated the Indian merchant to adjust charitable activity to *forms favourable to imperial values*, predominantly in the interest of socio-political elevation' (Ibid, 212; italics added for emphasis). The modernization of Indian philanthropy, historiography on the subject would suggest, was initiated in response to imperialism, where the ruling elites' 'political idiom' provided the reference around which the modernization of Indian philanthropy was modelled.

Unlike modernity's premise and promise of a rupture (Appadurai, 1996), the modernization of Indian philanthropy during colonialism, however, did not necessarily and completely dismantle pre-existing, traditional, community-centric charity. Its persistence, Haynes (1987) has argued, was a result of Indian traders' need to continue to invest in building their reputations within their own communities. Drawing from the remnants of such community-centric philanthropy from the past, a third narrative of Indian philanthropy attempts to resurrect a uniquely 'Indian' tradition of philanthropy. Turning to ancient scriptures, most commonly Islamic notions of *zakat* and Hindu conception of *dān* (see, e.g. Anderson, 1998; Arjomand, 1998; Juergensmeyer and McMahon, 1998), it argues that Indian philanthropy does not necessarily need to look at the contemporary West to re/formulate itself. Instead, it delves into religion, culture, tradition, and the past. Exemplars of nationalist narrative of Indian philanthropy, such as Pushpa Sundar (2000, 2013) have attempted combining these with Gandhian conceptions of trusteeship and service or *sewa*. Not only do they argue for an autonomous and pre-existing Indian 'tradition' which has contemporary and future relevance, they cite the role of modern Indian philanthropy in India's nationalism and later nation building (Cantegreil et al, 2013). For example, Lala's (2006) account of JNT attributed his business and philanthropy to his love for the country. Similarly, he placed the Tata Trusts' philanthropy as an investment in nation building (Lala, 1984).

Needless to mention, such narratives are hardly monolithic. They respond, variously and sometimes in limited ways, to criticisms of global capitalism, transactional behaviourism, modernity and neoliberalism. However, common to such narratives is the impulse to resurrect a uniquely 'Indian' 'tradition' of philanthropy. They turn both to the past (religious scriptures and community-centric charity) but are simultaneously amnesic as they ignore the effects of colonialism and imperialism in shaping modern Indian philanthropy. They are also unduly optimistic about Gandhian trusteeship as way of resolving businesses' relationship with society (Tripathi, 2014). Not only are they premised in conceptual misunderstanding but they also discount the problematic role of philanthropy in dealing with the excesses of their corporations (Kumar, 2013).

Despite the multi-disciplinary interest in modern Indian philanthropy, the corpus of scholarship – centred round the modernizing, managerial, and nationalist narratives– is limited in three main ways. One, it has been dominated by policy and practice manuals while analytical scholarship has remained thin (Sidel, 2001). Two, while historical research on modern Indian philanthropy has been both detailed and conceptually insightful, its attention has been focussed up to the nineteenth century (Haynes, 1987; Palsetia, 2003, 2005) and/or the colonial period (Mukherjee, 2009, for e.g. has focussed on Tatas' philanthropy in the early-twentieth century). A notable exception to this is Sundar (2000, 2013) who has attempted synthesizing Indian philanthropy in the twentieth century by emplacing it in an 'Indian' context. However, her work has been characterised by a number of serious deficiencies. Finally, barring the historiography of Indian philanthropy under colonialism, extant scholarship has provided us with a smooth – largely crafted around the modernizing, managerial, and nationalist – narrative. This article provides a corrective to the above. It builds on incipient but insightful scholarship, which has sought to move beyond the predominant narratives of modernization, managerialism, and nationalism. For example, in an excellent article on archaeological excavations funded by Sir Ratan Tata from 1913-18, historian Sraman Mukherjee (2009: 243) has argued that nationalist identities and practices were 'deeply imbricated in the same disciplinary and institutional spaces' as colonialism. Elsewhere, Bornstein (2009) has explored the tensions between spiritual and cultural impulses of giving against the growing regulation of organized philanthropy (similar to what

proponents of a managerial modernization have been arguing for). However, such accounts, which challenge straightforward narrations of Indian philanthropy, are altogether rare.

In the following section, I present a historical account of Tatas' philanthropy for scientific development in India. Before that, a brief overview of Tatas' philanthropy is presented next (see Lala, 1984 for a descriptive and sympathetic account).

TATAS, PHILANTHROPY AND SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENT

Tatas' foray into organized philanthropy began in 1892 with the founding of the JN Tata Endowment Fund, named after Jamsetji Nusserwanji Tata (1839-1904; JNT henceforth), founder of the Tata Group in 1868. The Fund supported the higher education of Indians abroad. Presently, the Group's philanthropy is organized into two major Trusts: Sir Ratan Tata Trust (SRTT) and Sir Dorabji Tata Trust (SDTT), and a number of smaller allied Trusts. SRTT, established in 1919, was instituted by JNT's younger son, Ratan (1871-1918; henceforth RJT) who was known for promoting art and his philanthropy. SRTT is allied with Navajbai Ratan Tata Trust, established in 1974. JNT's elder son, Dorab (1859-1932; DJT) is widely credited with the expansion of the Group's businesses, particularly in iron, steel, and power bequeathed his wealth to SDTT, which was established in 1932. SDTT is allied with nine other trusts. Among these, JRD Tata Trust was established in 1944 and it is named after Jehangir Ratan Dadabhoy Tata (1904-1993; henceforth JRD) who became the Chairman of the Group in 1938. Son of Ratanji Dadabhoy Tata, JNT's first cousin, and Sooni Tata, JRD is credited with consolidating the Group's businesses. Its objectives are similar to those of SDTT, in addition to which it also supports the higher education of Indians abroad. Other smaller Trusts include the Jamsetji Tata Trust (established in 1974) whose objectives are similar to SDTT, JRD and Thelma J Tata Trust (established in 1991) which supports oppressed women and children while the Lady Tata Memorial Trust provides scholarships for leukaemia research and funds fundamental research in science. Lady Meherbai Dorabji Tata Memorial Trust (established in 1932) supports Indian women to pursue higher studies abroad. Still other allied Trusts include Tata Education Trust (1990), Tata Social Welfare Trust (1990), and RD Tata Trust (1990).

Together, the Tata Trusts hold two-third equity of the Group's principal holding company, Tata Sons.[3] The Trusts work on a range of themes within their specific mandates: rural livelihoods, natural resource management, urban poverty, education and healthcare, building civil society, human rights, and promoting arts and culture. The Trusts engage in three types of grant making: programme grants for NGOs, individual support for education and medical needs, and institutional endowments. Previously, the Trusts were known for making endowments to science, social science and arts institution; over the last three decades, however, the Trusts have begun to award programme grants more frequently and extensively.

'Constructive philanthropy'

Crucial to understanding Tatas' philanthropy is the socio-political context in which Bombay Parsi philanthropy emerged and which was crucial to the community's rise to social and economic prominence in the eighteenth century (Desai, 1968; Karaka, 1884; Luhrmann, 1996). Moving from making tributes to building community infrastructure (White, 1991), the Bombay Parsis engaged actively in civic and secular philanthropy, which emulated the idiom of the ruling elite (Luhrmann, 1996; Palsetia, 2003, 2005). Like their contemporaries, the Tatas had also begun to move away from tribute and charity.

Departing from his father's use of charity to build community infrastructure for the Parsis (Harris, 1925: 120), JNT focussed on 'constructive philanthropy'. He believed '[w]hat advances a nation is not so much to prop up its weakest and most helpless members, as to lift up the best and most gifted so as to make them of the greatest service to the country.'[4] As part of which he founded the JN Tata Endowment Fund in 1892, which initially supported the higher education of Parsi students abroad, but was

[3] Excerpted from http://tata.com/aboutus/sub_index/Leadership-with-trust; accessed December 11, 2015.

[4] JNT's interview published in the *West Coast Spectator* on 9 February 1899 (cited from Lala 2004: 112), underlined by me for emphasis.

amended shortly after and made available 'to all capable natives of this country.'[5] More significantly, JNT endowed his wealth for the establishment of an institute of research and training in all branches of science and technology. Following protracted discussion with the colonial government for over a decade, the Indian Institute of Science (IISc) was established in 1909 in Bangalore (Ramanathan and Subbarayappa, 2011; Subbarayappa, 1992). Like JNT, his sons RJT and DJT also followed secular philanthropy with a focus on scientific research and training. RJT gifted his wealth for the 'advancement of Education Learning and Industry in all its branches including education economy sanitary (sic) – science and art for the relief of human suffering or for other works of public utility' in 1913.[6] It was to be used for public purposes without any preference to a particular community.[7] He believed in supporting excellence and provided for the recruitment of best researchers, globally, if any scientific institutions were to be endowed through SRTT. Likewise, in his Will from 1932, DJT also focussed on secular gift giving for scientific research, particularly in the fields of medicine and industry.[8]

As part of their on-going commitment for scientific development, an internal memorandum from 1932 noted that '[a] single discovery can be of benefit to millions' while a similar investment in education or economic development would have only yielded negligible results.[9] Noting the growing governmental investment in scientific development by mid-1940s, an internal note on the Tata Trusts' policy suggested earmarking ten percent of their outlay for scientific development, particularly outside

---

[5] From the Will of J N Tata dated 16 December 1896 in Lala (2004, 219-223).

[6] RJT's Will is dated March 20, 1913; with a Codicil dated 29 February 1916. File no. 178/RJT/PERS/LEG/WILL/1, TCA.

[7] Although RJT provided philanthropy for all communities, he noted that if any exception were to be made, it must be toward his own Parsi community.

[8] Deed of SDTT dated 11 March 1932. File no. 177/DTT/DEED/AGR/1932, TCA.

[9] From the Memorandum dated 22 December 1932 on Muzumdar's interview with SF Markham, File no. SDTT BO Meetings, 1932-2005, TCA; also see a Preliminary Report for the Trustees of the Sir Dorabji Tata Trust Suggesting Methods of Utilizing the Present Income of the Trust and the Broad Lines of Future Engagement [1944]; from File no. 198/DTT/PHIL/TISS/FP/4, TCA.

Bombay, such as in Calcutta and Bangalore.[10] This led to the establishment of a number of research and training institutions, including the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research (TIFR), Bombay established in 1945, on which more follows; and Tata Memorial Hospital (TMH, 1941) and Tata Medical Centre (2011) in medicine. They also endowed a number of social science institutions and research centres including a Research Chair at the London School of Economics and Political Science from 1913 onward and the Tata Institute of Social Sciences (henceforth TISS, founded in 1936 as the Sir Dorabji Tata Graduate School of Social Work). They also endowed the Demographic Research and Training Centre (DRTC, 1956), Bombay, and the National Institute of Advanced Studies, Bangalore in 1988. In addition to this, the Tata Trusts also endowed the National Centre for the Performing Arts, Bombay in 1968. As a result of their extensive and sustained commitment to scientific development, it has been acknowledged that in comparison to other Indian philanthropists from the twentieth century, the Tatas were the only ones committed to supporting science, social science, humanities, and industries (Sebaly, 1985).

Far more than their contemporaries, the Tatas have been engaged in systematic and organized philanthropy based on research and reason. JNT's close associate Burjorji Padshah recalled that JNT held the opinion that 'service to the needy could no more be made without brains, without investigation, without the selection of the right men, and without concentration on particular aspects, than the production of any other species of goods' (cited in Harris 1925: 120). In 1932, the Trusts invited SF Markham to advice on the Trusts' potential philanthropic strategy. Citing the example of the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations, Markham suggested that the Trusts' approach philanthropy in a scientific manner.[11] Such suggestions were repeated in a separate Report from 1944, which exhorted the Trusts to focus on prevention and not simply relief by taking the

[10] From A Note on Sir Dorabji Tata Trust Policy dated 10 April 1944. File no. FP-NO-022B-1944-04-10, TCA.

[11] From the Memorandum dated 22 December 1932 on Muzumdar's interview with S F Markham, File no. SDTT BO Meetings, 1932-2005, TCA.

long-range view of eliminating the very causes of social distress.[12] It called for a fact-based, scientific approach to its work, by engaging external expertise to replace members of the Tata family and leaders from its companies. As I have discussed elsewhere, this use of experts in philanthropy has only intensified since, although in different forms (Kumar, Cooke and Brigham, 2016).

Instructive here is the Tata Trusts' modelling of their philanthropy on US Foundations' 'scientific philanthropy' (Howe, 1980). Following the 'Big Three' Foundations, the Tatas not only made extensive gifts to scientific research, training, and for establishing altogether new institutions, but also engaged in approaching their gift-giving in a scientific manner. At the same time, a number of institutes endowed by the Tatas were also modelled on American research institutions. IISc, for example, was modelled on the John Hopkins University (Sebaly 1985; Subbarayappa 1992). Its establishment was hailed as 'another illustration of the quiet working of American influence and example in the Orient.'[13] Still later in 1918, JNT's elder son DJT proposed an Indian Institute of Medical Research, modelled on the Rockefeller Institute of America.[14] It was pursued with the imperial government for a number of years without success (see Kavadi, 2011 for an extended discussion). The proposal exhorted that India, like US, could engage in cutting-edge medical research by following the trajectory pursued by the Americans, which much interested DJT. Similar references to US Foundations' 'scientific philanthropy' can also be found in Tatas' own history writing of their philanthropy. For example, an unpublished report (*c*. 1950s) drew parallels between JNT and Andrew Carnegie in their inclination in using their wealth for 'constructive purposes'; and

---

[12] From a Preliminary Report for the Trustees of the Sir Dorabji Tata Trust Suggesting Methods of Utilizing the Present Income of the Trust and the Broad Lines of Future Engagement; from File no. 198/DTT/PHIL/TISS/FP/4, TCA. Such equivalence can also be found in the communication material compiled on the Group's corporate website; from "Values are Forever," R. Gopalakrishnan, Tata Group, accessed 25 June 2013, http://www.tata.com/aboutus/articlesinside/UUp6bB5QnSo=/TLYVr3YPkMU=.

[13] From 'The Hopkins, His Model: A Parsee Millionaire will Found a University in India Along the Same Lines,' *The Baltimore Sun*, 19 May 1899; cited in Subbarayappa (1992: 27-28).

[14] 'A Proposal for the Foundation of "An Indian Institute of Medical Research"' by R. McCarrison dated 28 May 1918. File no. Home Department, Medical A, Proceedings nos. 86-88, January 1919, NAI.

compared JNT's endowment for IISc with those made by the Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Ford Foundations.[15]

'Indian science'

Beginning from the 1940s, Tatas' philanthropy for scientific development was recast more explicitly in the national question. Here, I focus in particular on the establishment of Tata Institute of Fundamental Research (TIFR henceforth), Bombay.[16] As nationalism gained greater ground, the urgent requirements of a post-colonial nation became more evident. In 1943, Homi J Bhabha, later TIFR's founder Director, wrote a letter to JRD citing the 'lack of proper conditions and insufficient financial support,' which had impeded scientific development in the country.[17] In particular, India had lagged behind in high-quality fundamental scientific research, according to Bhabha, due to the 'absence of a sufficient number of pure research workers who would set the standard of good research and act on the directing boards in an advisory capacity.' In order to overcome this deficit, TIFR was founded in 1945, which Bhabha believed was 'absolutely in the interest of India.'[18] Research at TIFR, particularly in the area of nuclear power, was deemed crucial for fulfilling India's growing energy needs as a rapidly industrializing nation and, in turn, making it self-reliant. Expectedly so, scientific research at TIFR received active support from the post-colonial Indian state, which was aided in part by Bhabha proximity to then-Prime Minister Nehru. The

[15] From File no. 181/DTT/PHIL/MIS/3, TCA.

[16] TIFR, I would argue, presents an excellent example of the insertion of science into nation building for a number of reasons: first, owing to the time of its founding in 1945, the Institute was founded in a period of transition in governing regime from colonial, imperial state to post-colonial nation-state. More importantly, the fundamental research being conducted on atomic energy at the Institute was central to national interests: both as part of the country's energy requirements and its defence capabilities.

[17] From Bhabha's letter to JRD written on 19 August 1943, cited in File no. 194/DTT/PHIL/TIFR/FP/1, TCA.

[18] Bhabha's proposal, dated 12 March 1944 to Sir Sorab Saklatvala for the establishment of the TIFR; File no. 194/DTT/PHIL/TIFR/FP/1, TCA.

support of the Indian state was acknowledged by JRD who noted Nehru's deep and full appreciation and support for 'Indian science.'[19]

Although JRD did not specifically articulate his conception of 'Indian science,' it can be reasonably inferred that he was referring to the central and significant role of science in India's development, particularly in its heavy industry, chemical, metallurgical, energy, and its agricultural sectors.[20] It also referred to the production of science in India at institutions modelled on those in 'Cambridge and Paris' (Chowdhury and Dasgupta, 2010: 112), and led by Indian scientists. To encourage Indian scientists trained or employed outside the country, Bhabha invoked the nation rhetorically. In a speech in 1954, Bhabha said that he had come to conclusion that 'provided proper appreciation and financial support are forthcoming, it is one's duty to stay in one's own country and build up schools comparable with those that other countries are fortunate in possessing'.[21] This call for fulfilling one's national duty was repeated in the recruitment bids for other promising Indian scientists who had been trained or were then employed outside the country. For example, Bhabha wrote to S Chandrashekhar in 1944 (later awarded a Nobel Prize in 1983 as a US citizen) at the University of Chicago, that it was Chandrashekhar's national duty to work in India. Since the Trusts' existing budgetary outlay was insufficient to involve Chandrashekhar, JRD even wrote to Sir Ness Wadia to endow a Chair to facilitate Chandrashekhar's recruitment at TIFR.[22] Although Bhabha failed to convince Chandrashekhar to return to India, such exchanges were emblematic of the contemporary spirit of nation building where the scientists were expected to engage in research, particularly that which could be harnessed to India's economic and social development as part of their national 'duty.'

---

[19] From JRD's speech on 1 January 1954 at the foundation stone laying ceremony of TIFR; File no. 196/DTT/PHIL/TIFR/MIS/12, TCA.

[20] From JRD's Presidential Address to the 18th Meeting of IISc's Court on 26 March 1955. File no. 190/DTT/PHIL/IISC/MIS/5, TCA.

[21] Foundation stone laying ceremony of the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay, 1 January 1954; File no. 196/DTT/PHIL/TIFR/MIS/12, TCA; underlined in original.

[22] From File no. 195/DTT/PHIL/TIFR/MIS/2, TCA.

The production of 'Indian science,' however, was not a move towards the isolation of Indian science and its scientists but their internationalization. Among others, I provide here two related, though somewhat contrary, examples. The first example relates to attempts from the mid-twentieth century at restricting LTMT's international funding for blood-related diseases to Indian scientists and institutions. Since its inception in 1932, a large number of Indian scientists had applied for support to LTMT with little success until 1946.[23] It led SS Sokhey of the Indian Medical Service to suggest in 1948 that LTMT's philanthropy should be restricted Indian scientists and institutions while its scope of medical research could be enlarged beyond research on leukaemia and other blood-related diseases. The international advisory Committee discussed Sokhey's suggestion and came to the view that 'the gain to India from any such arrangement would be disproportionately small, as compared with the prestige which had accrued and would continue to accrue to that country from the maintenance of the present very fruitful scheme of international awards.'[24] Later, JRD raised the matter again in a meeting with the advisory committee in September 1951.[25] In November, 1951 it was decided that the international character of research supported by LTMT and focussed research on leukaemia should be retained, while applications from TMH, India would continue to be considered on merit.[26] Despite internal efforts, LTMT remained steadfastly international in its orientation, which Kavadi (2014) has noted as a highlight of Indian philanthropic contribution to Western medicine.

---

[23] From Scientific Advisory Committee of the Lady Tata Memorial Trust: Minutes; File no. PP/DAG/D/2/2, Wellcome Library Archives (WLA).

[24] From Scientific Advisory Committee of the Lady Tata Memorial Trust: Minutes of the Meeting dated 13 April 1944; File no. PP/DAG/D/2/2, WLA.

[25] The meeting was organized on 20 September 1951 and Note written on 1 October 1951. It was attended by HH Dale, F James, JRD Tata, and FHK Green. At the meeting, JRD insisted that he would like research at the Tata Memorial Hospital (TMH), Bombay to be supported through the international awards. The representatives of the Committee, in their personal capacity, added that a good application was likely to be recommended. Scientific Advisory Committee of the Lady Tata Memorial Trust: Minutes; File no. PP/DAG/D/2/2, WLA.

[26] Scientific Advisory Committee of the Lady Tata Memorial Trust: Minutes of the Meeting organized on 23 November 1951; File no. PP/DAG/D/2/2, WLA.

The second example relates to Tatas' extensive support for international training and exchange of Indian scientists, starting with the JNT's Endowment Fund from 1892 onward. Evidence of their strong support for such exchanges can be found in various institutions endowed by them, particularly TIFR and TMH, and even later once these Institutes were handed over to the Government of India.[27] For example, in correspondence over Demographic Research and Training Centre's (DTRC) transfer to the Government of India, John Matthai argued in 1957 that 'an exchange of workers between our Centre and other population institutes abroad should be welcomed as a useful development conferring benefit on all the parties that are concerned.'[28] Similarly, in 1959-60, differences emerged between the Government of India and the Tata Trusts over the functioning of TMH, ICRC (Indian Cancer Research Centre) and DRTC. In a letter written on behalf of SDTT, its Director Rustum Choksi argued that the government must deal sympathetically with proposals for the training and deputation of the scientists, and necessary arrangements must be made to avoid any difficulties in the future.[29]

Alongside the scientific training and development of Indian scientists abroad, the Tatas were committed to their cultural modernization. For example, in his Presidential Address at the Meeting of the Court of IISc in 1954, John Matthai discussed the need for social science education for Indian scientists to understand the 'human problems of adjustment and reconciliation' that came with modern technological advancement.[30] Likewise, JRD argued in 1955 that the scientists ought to possess 'knowledge and understanding of the broad human problems that will face them and their compatriots

---

[27] In a letter to JRD on 19 August 1943, Bhabha argued in favour of large-scale visits of international scholars to TIFR, citing that the costs involved outweighed the benefits; File no. 194/DTT/PHIL/TIFR/FP/1, TCA.

[28] From Matthai's letter to Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, Minister of Health, Government of India, dated 4 February 1957; File no. 187/DTT/PHIL/IIPS/MIS/1, TCA.

[29] File no. 209/DTT/PHIL/TMH/ICRC/APP/1, TCA.

[30] Presidential Address by J Matthai, 17th Meeting of the Court, Indian Institute of Science, 20 March 1954. File no. 189/DTT/PHIL/IISC/MIS/1, TCA.

and equipped with a mental outlook which keeps step with the fast changing world.'[31] Not only did the Indian scientists need to develop an international outlook but also a cosmopolitan disposition. That is, '[i]f the scientists at Bhabha's institute were capable of holding their own in scientific conversations with the first world, they would not be found lacking in adopting what came to [be] seen as "international" cultural mores,' (Chowdhury, 2012: 60-1) including their food and dining habits, sartorial preferences, use of lavatories, etc.

Paralleling the cultural modernization of Indian scientists was Tatas' interest in the modernization of Indian society itself, on which more below.

Social science and modernization

The Tatas expressed an interest in endowing social science and humanities research and training at IISc when its proposal was prepared in 1899.[32] However, Tatas' proposal failed to materialise for various reasons, which are beyond the scope of this article (Sebaly, 1985; Subbarayappa, 1992). Tatas' attempts were revived in 1910 when RJT proposed an endowment for establishing a School of Social Studies at IISc.[33] It was premised in the belief that a modern society was a pre-requisite for the country's on-going industrialization. In this, the social sciences were required to ascertain the readiness of Indian society toward modernity and suggest ways for its reform. In his letter to the Director, IISc, Burjorji Padshah outlined Tatas' plans for a post-graduate School that could 'comprehend the whole life of man from cradle to the grave.' It was expected to focus on research with a particular emphasis on applied social science research, and not on teaching as was otherwise common.[34] Much like the sciences, research at the School was expected to help identify causal relationships using the

[31] From the Presidential Address to the 18th Meeting of the Court, IISc by JRD on 26 March 1955. File no. 190/DTT/PHIL/IISC/MIS/7, TCA.

[32] File no. L/PJ/6/554, 2150, IOR.

[33] File no. Passfield 10/2/1, London School of Economics Archives (LSEA).

[34] Correspondence between Padshah and Director, Indian Institute of Science regarding the establishment of Sir Ratan Tata School of Social Science dated 19 May 1910; includes an outline of proposed school. File no. Passfield 10/2/1, LSEA.

'positive and comparative method.' Decrying the deductive research that went on in other contemporary institutions in the country, it argued that its research would be 'systematic' and based on 'the positive method'. As part of IISc, the School was expected to share research in subjects such 'Heredity, or statistical methods' with the physical science departments. Once it became clear that the School could no longer be established at IISc, RJT went on to sponsor research on poverty and social administration at the London School of Economics, which led to the Department of Social Science and Administration.

Tatas' proposal for endowing social science research institutes in India were revived again in the 1930s when it was suggested that SDTT support the establishment of a Bureau of Social and Industrial research.[35] As before, the proposed Bureau was expected to focus on social reform in order to complement on-going industrialization in the country. Their efforts took concrete shape in the form of TISS, Bombay, initially called the Sir Dorabji Tata School of Social Work.[36] Departing from its earlier proposals, TISS was expected to focus more on training than research with an institutional mandate for practical application of social thought to solve the social problems affecting the country.[37] A key concern, however, was the availability of appropriate curricular resources. C Manshardt, the Founder Director at TISS, invoked the universality of human experience,[38] and suggested that the students and teachers translate Western material to the Indian context.[39] This, in effect, meant that the

---

[35] From a Preliminary Report for the Trustees of the Sir Dorabji Tata Trust Suggesting Methods of Utilizing the Present Income of the Trust and the Broad Lines of Future Engagement. File no. 198/DTT/PHIL/TISS/FP/4, TCA; underlined in original.

[36] Early approval to the Scheme, drafted by Manshardt was given, and he was asked to develop the 'concrete details of organization'; from Minutes, 19th Meeting of the Board of Trustees, SDTT, dated 6 July 1935. File no. 178/DTT/DJT/PERS/PROP/LEG/WILLS/BO/OPT-/1, TCA.

[37] From a proposal titled 'Tentative Plans for the Sir Dorabji Tata School of Social Work', dated 15 July 1935 (hand-written date on typed pages); File no. 199/DTT/PHIL/TISS/MIS/1, TCA.

[38] Address delivered by Manshardt titled *The School of Social Work and its Students*, at the Opening Session of the Sir Dorabji Tata Graduate School of Social Work, 20 June 1938, Bombay. File no. 198/DTT/PHIL/TISS/FP/5, TCA.

[39] In orientating social work to the 'Indian' condition, a proposal for the School suggested that it 'will place at the disposal of the Indian student the best social thought of the day and will encourage the Indian student to undertake fundamental research into Indian social and industrial

indigenization of the social work/sciences was largely an exercise of translation.[40] Here, it is worth noticing how little effort there was at producing 'new' social thought based on the Indian experience despite Tatas' earlier proposals to fund research on Indian society and its relationship with on-going industrial and scientific development. By early 1950s, however, the effectiveness of such translations had come under challenge. An institution-wide review conducted in 1953 at TISS questioned the previous attempts at translation of social theory.[41] It cautioned against the use of Western social theory and practice given the differences in conditions; and argued that 'what is universal should be distinguished from what is applicable only in local circumstances.' Here, one finds the tension between the universal nature of modernity being challenged in the early years of post-colonialism, which called for theorizing Indian situation on its own terms.

Toward rural development

From the 1950s onward, the focus of Tatas' philanthropy for scientific development had begun to shift from industry to agriculture and rural development.[42] With the founding of the Rural Welfare Board (RWB) in 1953 and later the work of the Tata Relief Committee (TRC) in 1960s-70s, the Tata Trusts supported the modernization of rural livelihoods and society (Lala 1984; for a more analytical discussion, Kumar, 2015). Premised in building self-reliance among rural communities, the Tatas supported

---

problems'. Thus, TISS sought to use Western social thought to understand the specifics of the Indian social condition; File no.199/DTT/PHIL/TISS/MIS/1, TCA.

[40] In his address at the opening session, Manshardt again highlighted the need for translation; from the Address delivered by Manshardt titled The School of Social Work and its Students, at the Opening Session of the Sir Dorabji Tata Graduate School of Social Work, 20 June 1938, Bombay; File no. 198/DTT/PHIL/TISS/FP/5, TCA.

[41] The review was conducted by J Matthai, A Wilkins and E Younghusband, dated January 1953; File no. 195/DTT/PHIL/TIFR/MIS/1, TCA.

[42] Making the shift in SDTT's priorities clear, Rustum Choksi noted in his letter to the Director General of Health Services, Government of India on September 25, 1951 that the Trustees had turned their 'attention to other nation-building activities'. Further, they had been considering

the idea of village development and would like to be free to apply a substantial measure of the Trust's resources to a workable scheme that would both establish a model group of villages, through self-help methods aided by Trust funds, and at the same time ensure continuity for constructive work of this kind on a wider scale. File no. 207/DTT/PHIL/TMH/FP/2, TCA.

agricultural development (soil moisture retention, irrigation extension, mechanization of agricultural processing, etc.) and scientific animal husbandry.[43] Such programmes were designed alongside social reform interventions, including the provision of education, drinking water, sanitation and family planning. Such interventions were designed to attack the root causes of poverty and were not 'wedded to any isms.'[44] However, these were primarily restricted to disaster-affected areas (in the case of TRC) or demonstration sites only (RWB).

At the same time and in continuation of their earlier philanthropy of endowing institutions, the Tatas continued to support the founding of scientific research institutions in this area. Such institutions were expected to conduct research, which responded to the particular and local needs of poor communities in India.[45] These included JRD Tata Ecotechnology Centre, Centre for Medicinal Plants Research, and Sir Dorabji Tata Centre for Research in Tropical Diseases, among others.

With the expansion of Trusts' operations, post-1990s, the Tatas have been involved more actively and extensively than ever before in the modernization of rural livelihoods and production systems. They have done so in two related ways. Second, the Trusts have been supporting a large number of non-governmental organizations involved in farm and farm-based livelihoods as part of their rural development strategy. The Trusts support has mainly focussed on organization and collectivization of producers on the one hand, and technological input for enhancing yield on the other. Over time, the Trusts' support to non-governmental organizations has come to be organized around particular geographical regions. As part of this and thirdly, the Trusts have been

---

[43] See 'Devapur Project: Achievements of a quiet, persistent effort by Tatas for the development of a drought prone area (1952-1984)'; file no. 185/DTT/PHIL/RWB/BO/1963/1, TCA. Also see YS Pandit's *A Survey of Devapur, 1972*, RWB; File no. 186, TCA and *A Survey of Devapur, 1986*, RWB. File no. 185A, TCA.

[44] From a report titled, Devapur Project: Achievements of a quiet, persistent effort by Tatas for the development of a drought prone area (1952-1984). File no. 185/DTT/PHIL/RWB/BO/1963/1, TCA.

[45] MS Swaminathan in SDTT's Annual Report (2003-04); File no. 210/SDTT/2003-04, TCA.

engaging actively in building partnerships with non-governmental organizations, agricultural research institutions, and state and local governments.

Through the institution of autonomous 'cells', the Tata Trusts have been supporting the translation of developmental policy and scientific knowledge from the 'lab' into rural development in the 'field'. The cells have been envisaged, variously, as 'knowledge banks;' 'bridges' between academic institutions where research resides, technical resource agencies with the know-how of doing it, and organizations with the poor communities in the field; and developing 'innovative concepts for field-level piloting'.[46] In this, the Tata Trusts perceive their role as one of '"lab to land" transfer of knowledge and ideas'.[47] The Central India Initiative funded jointly by SRTT and SDTT, for example, 'steers the activity of converting research findings into action plans, and testing the recommendations of the research in the field. It supports field experiments and tests ideas through small grants and brings to the fore replicable models.'[48] Still other cells supported by the Tata Trusts include the Coastal Salinity Prevention Cell addressing livelihood issues of communities affected by salinity ingress in coastal Gujarat, Himmotthan Pariyojana working on environmental degradation in the central Himalayan region, and the Sukhi Baliraja Initiative working on agrarian distress in Vidharbha.

The Tata Trusts have been extending their cell-based model of facilitating and translating scientific knowledge and developmental policy into field-based action to other sectors beyond agriculture. For example, the problems plaguing the water-sector in the country are articulated as a split between science, policy, and development practice. The role of the various Cells supported by the Tata Trusts, therefore, has been to bring relevant

---

[46] "Kharash Vistarotthan Yojana," SRTT, accessed 4 December 2014, http://srtt.org/institutional_grants/rural_livelihoods_communities/kharash_vistarotthan_yojana.htm.

[47] Annual Report, SDTT, 2004-05. File no. 182/SDTT/2004-05, TCA.

[48] "Central India Initiative," SRTT, accessed 28 February 2015, http://srtt.org/institutional_grants/rural_livelihoods_communities/central_india_initiative.htm.

knowledge to the policy-makers by bringing it to them in a 'policy-relevant fashion.'[49]

DISCUSSION

The history of Tata Trusts' involvement in scientific development in the country is both extensive and sustained but also multi-faceted. It has been shaped by diverse influences not limited to the managerial, modernizing, and nationalist narratives that have dominated prior scholarship on Indian philanthropy. The historical ways by which Tatas' philanthropy for scientific development have come to take shape, I argue in this section, can be understood as paradoxical and pragmatic. In so doing, I extend and build on Markvoits' (1996, 2008) characterization of Tatas' business during colonialism as a paradox. Comparing Tatas with various indigenous and expatriate firms of colonial India, Markovits (2008: 154-5) argued that it 'displayed characteristics of both the indigenous and expatriate ones, in addition to some which appear largely unique, and which therefore tended to straddle the boundary between those two types of firms,' which he posits as a paradox. Their modern, organized, secular philanthropy in post/colonial India can be usefully characterized as paradoxical: that is, one encounters contrary evidences from what one might have expected or believed for the context in which the Tatas' operated. It was also pragmatic, I argue, in that it was attuned toward practical and not necessarily theoretical, principled, or normative considerations.

Historiography of modern Indian philanthropy in western India (Haynes, 1987), particularly among the Parsi community to which the Tatas belonged (Karaka, 184; Luhrmann, 1996; Palsetia, 2003, 2005; White, 1991), has outlined the formative influence of colonialism and imperialism. As part of which, philanthropy moved away from tributes to ruling elites and kinship-centric charity. Departing from his father's community-centric charity in the nineteenth century which believed in 'alms-giving and doing good to others' (Harris, 1958: xi), JNT engaged in 'constructive philanthropy.' In this, the community was displaced and the 'nation' was installed as the central objective

[49] "Water Sector Research," SRTT, accessed 4 December 2014, http://srtt.org/institutional_grants/rural_livelihoods_communities/water_sector_research.htm.

and object of development. It was largely secular in its orientation, which distinguishes them from contemporary Indian philanthropists.[50] The Birlas, for example, were actively engaged in building caste-specific community infrastructure in the twentieth century (Kudaisya, 2003) and in supporting the construction of Hindu temples across major Indian cities. However, Tatas' philanthropy went beyond the mimicry of 'imperial values' (Haynes, 1987; Palsetia, 2003, 2005) as might have been expected.

It shared more in common with US Foundations' 'scientific philanthropy' (Howe, 1980) than with imperial values. Similar to US philanthropy from the early twentieth centuries (namely the Carnegie and Rockefeller families), the Tatas were involved in endowing scientific research and institutions. Not only was the scale and extent of their philanthropy more extensive when compared to contemporary Indian philanthropy at the turn of the twentieth century (Sebaly, 1985), their focus was also not on palliative interventions but preventative, much like the large US Foundations in the first half of the twentieth century. In addition, the Tatas followed systematic and informed ways of making gifts. Although current research, popular and otherwise, has been exhorting contemporary Indian philanthropy to become more scientifically organized and managed, the Tatas were pursuing this mode of organizing their philanthropy since the 1930s. They focussed on fact-based and calculated decision-making, which was managed by professionals and experts and not business leaders and their advisors, as was otherwise common. A similarly pragmatic approach to philanthropy which denounced ideology and dogma can also be found in their philanthropy for a positivist social science research and social work and its role in the modernization of society in the country, on which more later in this section. There are other substantive similarities in US Foundations' 'scientific philanthropy' and JNT and later others' 'constructive philanthropy.' Andrew Carnegie's philanthropy was built for and around (as a stratagem) the 'exceptional man': 'To discover the exceptional man in every department of study whenever and wherever found, inside or outside of schools, and enable him to

[50] Although largely secular, Tatas' philanthropy did not disengage entirely from its Parsi affiliation. As I have argued elsewhere (Kumar, 2015), the history of Tatas' philanthropy suggests that special provisions have always been made for Parsi individuals and institutions, including community infrastructure and its maintenance.

make the work for which he seems specially designed his life work' (cited from Kohler, 1991: 8). Likewise, JNT believed that Indian philanthropy ought to invest not in the 'best and most gifted' Indians, as the route to the country's development. The search of excellence, globally, in scientific development was carried forward by his sons, RJT and DJT, who believed in recruiting internationally for the institutions endowed by them (Kavadi, 2011; Kumar, 2015). Such references to and comparisons with US philanthropic Foundations can also be found in the archival material on their own history writing, as discussed previously. Thus, while it was reasonable to expect that like other Bombay Parsis, Tatas' philanthropy would have been influenced by imperial values, it was US Foundations' 'scientific philanthropy,' paradoxically, that has had a more formative influence.

However, it is instructive to note that Tatas' emulation of US Foundations' 'scientific philanthropy' was driven by distinct political beliefs. It is now well acknowledged that the US Foundations played a substantial and influential role in promoting American interests in India, particularly in the post-World War II period and later the Cold War (Parmar, 2012). The active engagement of US Foundations was premised in fighting communism and pointing post-colonial nation-states in South Asia towards Western democracy and liberal developmentalism (Hess, 2003, 2005). India, which was seen as an 'essential democracy' (Hess, 2005: 52) and crucial to world peace (Staples, 1992: 6), became the frontier of US Foundations' interventions as part of Americanization of the globe and US global fight against communism. Tatas' philanthropy, however, has always been geographically contained. Given the constraints of resources and the enormity and multitude of causes requiring attention, a pragmatic decision was taken in 1932 that the Tatas' philanthropy maintain its focus on India and its developmental issues.[51] It was not necessarily driven by the need to counter Nehruvian socialism in the post-colonial period. Although the Tatas did make use of their philanthropy to support anti-socialist think tanks and political activity (Kumar, 2015; Markovits, 2008), it was restricted to the realm of politics alone. There is no archival evidence to suggest that

[51] From the Memorandum dated 22 December 1932 on Muzumdar's interview with SF Markham, File no. SDTT BO Meetings, 1932-2005, TCA.

their philanthropy for scientific development was, in any way, imbricated in its fight against Nehruvian socialism. Tatas' philanthropy for scientific development has been shaped, therefore, less by their ideological commitment to countering socialism in the country. Instead, politics and scientific development were conceptualised, practically, into two distinct domains.

Such a pragmatic distinction can also be found in Tatas' engagement with the national question through their philanthropy.

As I have argued previously, following the modernization of their philanthropy from the 1890s onward, the national question became the central organizing trope of Tatas' philanthropy. This has also been noted by scholars (Luhrmann, 1996; on a different reading of the nationalist register see Mukherjee, 2009), biographers (Lala, 2006), and expectedly so, as part of their corporate publicity material available online. However, this does not necessarily mean that the Tatas were committed to India's political nationalism during colonialism. Palsetia (2001), for example, has pointed to JNT's lack of forthright support to the Congress. Writing in *Young India* in 1921, MK Gandhi (1979, [22]: 456) argued that the Tatas had been taken over by the 'Rockefeller spirit' and that their pursuit of India's industrialization had resulted in their neglect of India's masses and their desires. Unlike GD Birla and to a lesser extent Jamnalal Bajaj, both of whom are widely recognised for their philanthropic support to Gandhian nationalism and his philosophy of trusteeship (Chakrabarty, 2015), Tatas' philanthropic commitment to nation building has been restricted to the realms of industry and agriculture.

Departing from the Gandhian rejection of modernity and industry, the Tatas expressed their belief in 'Indian science' as – and part of – its development. Without substantiating its meaning and contours, Tatas' emphasis on 'Indian science' in the mid-twentieth century can be inferred to refer to a recognition of the role of science in the country's economic development, which was in large part informed through the Nehruvian imagination of modernity (Seth, 1993). It was also concerted effort toward the production of scientific knowledge in Indian institutions and by Indian scientists as part

of their national duty. At the same time, it also referred to the Indian state's patronage of scientific institutions. 'Indian science', JRD argued, had been fortunate to receive extensive support from then-Prime Minister Nehru. This, as Chowdhury (2012) has proposed, was constitutive of the nationalist but also modern discourse of self-reliance that the Tatas pursued through their philanthropy: where the Indian ability to produce cutting-edge scientific research was indicative of having shrugged off its dependency on the West. The sovereignty of the nation was seen as tied with the sovereignty of its science. It was accompanied by concerted moves toward the internationalization of 'Indian science' and its scientists. Such an internationalization was not counter but a constituent of moves toward building national self-reliance (following Chowdhury, 2012). It involved a cultural modernization of Indian scientists through their training in social science, developing a cosmopolitan outlook, and cultivating modern disposition.

Social science was also seen crucial for preparing the Indian society to reap the benefits of its on-going scientific development. This echoes with Prakash (1999: 193) who has argued that '[s]cience could not, however, orchestrate India's industrialization on a systematic basis without organization.' Through their proposals for endowing social science research institutions in the early years of the twentieth century, some of which failed to materialize, the Tatas looked to support positivist, 'scientific' research into the causes of social maladjustments and identify ways for their reform. They proposed the use of surveys on an array of topics to compile information on the life of the masses, literally from 'cradle to grave' and sometimes and even prior to the cradle and beyond the grave. The use of 'technics' of research and training were an integral part of the governmentalization of the post/colonial nation-state (Prakash 1999) and the re/organization of the masses into known and knowable 'population' (Chatterjee 1993). The categorization of masses was expected to lead to scientifically designed social interventions. Doing so successfully, however, required an act of translation: of Western social theory into the Indian context. Thus, the development of India not only required science and technology, but also a scientifically (by way of method but also in its content) reformed, and so modernized, society, which the social sciences were tasked with.

With this, Tatas' philanthropy turned to rural livelihoods and societies. They proposed the transfer of technology in order to modernize rural agriculture, processing, and animal husbandry. Alongside which, the Tatas promoted social re-organization. Driven by the objective of self-reliance, such interventions were designed to fulfil the practical needs for missing social and physical infrastructure in India's villages. In this, one can find parallels with the Ford Foundations interventions in community-development programmes (Ensminger, 1972). Unlike the Ford Foundations' complicity in countering socialism in India, Tatas' philanthropy was driven by the rejection of all forms of political ideology and dogma. The scale of their philanthropy during the 1950s-70s, however, was restricted to a small scale. They began to gravitate toward partnership-based modes of development, particularly post-1990s when the Tata Trusts resources and s' philanthropic support for rural development was on a much smaller scale, most notably in Devapur and restricted to disaster-affected regions in 1960s-1970s through TRC's relief and rehabilitation work. Tatas' philanthropy for scientific development in rural areas has been delivered in partnership with NGOs and on a much larger-scale, post-1990s, as the Trusts' resources and scale of operations expanded considerably.

Post-1990s, the Trusts have been supporting the archiving of scientific knowledge and practice and translation of policy in the field through pilots, demonstrations and models through the institution of specialised Cells. In this, it is a continuation of its earlier mode of supporting development through RWB and TRC from 1953-70s. However, while it was actively involved in implementation then, it has now moved to a facilitative role. In this, Tatas' philanthropy can be understood as part of contemporary development partnerships (Morvaridi, 2012; Richey and Ponte, 2014). While its mode of supporting development can be understood as part of neoliberalism, the Tata Trusts have recognised its fallout on the farmers, artisans, and local entrepreneurs.[52] Without devoting itself entirely to a market-centric model of neoliberal development, the Tata Trusts have chosen to focus on the pragmatic need for bringing scientific knowledge, practice, and development action together.

[52] Biennial Report. SDTT. 2000-02. File no. 182/SDTT/2000-02, TCA.

CONCLUSION

Although history has provided rich and compelling insight into the modernization of Indian philanthropy, it has focussed its attention to the colonial period only. The post-colonial period, where Tatas' philanthropy came to be organised more centrally around the national question and gravitated toward rural development has received little attention. This article provides a corrective. I have also argued that Indian philanthropy needs to be understood beyond the straightforward narratives of managerialism, modernization, and nationalism that have predominated extant scholarship. Moving beyond available hagiography (Lala, 1984) and episodic or institutional historiography (Chowdhury, 2011; Kavadi, 2014; Mukherjee, 2009; Ramanathan and Subbarayappa, 2011) of Tatas' philanthropy for scientific development, I argue that it has been shaped, historically and variously, by colonialism, imperialism, managerialism, modernity, nationalism and later nation building, neoliberalism, and secularism in particular kinds of ways. Taking a comprehensive, long-term historical view has helped map the pragmatic and paradoxical ways in which Tatas' philanthropy has been shaped. It has often been directed by practical concerns and a 'scientific' calculus and less by a singular – normative or theoretical – vision. At the same time, it has often taken turns contrary to what might have been expected.

Philanthropy, therefore, ought to be understood as an assemblage of meaning, motive, and influences, even if sometimes contradictory. This is particularly true for non-Western 'traditions' of philanthropy, whose taxonomy and relationship with development might be more complicated. In their overview of philanthropy in Latin America, Landim and Thompson (1997), for example, have argued that their first challenge was to develop a common understanding of what it might mean. Moving past straightforward, smooth, or singular narratives, I would argue that we might need to look for unexpected and even contrary evidences. This will help rephrase our understanding of philanthropy beyond somewhat expected binaries (good vs malignant, Parmar, 2012; scientific vs disorganized charity; or Western vs 'traditional' etc.) and the search for singular, unifying narratives.

References:

Archival Sources:

India Office Records, British Library, London (IOR)

Archives and Special Collections, London School of Economics Library, London (LSEA)

Tata Central Archives, Pune (TCA)

Archives and Manuscripts, Wellcome Library, London (WLA).

Collected Papers:

Gandhi, MK. *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi.* (1939), published by the Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, 1965, reprinted in 1979. Available at: http://www.gandhiserve.org/cwmg; accessed 3 April 2014.

Books and Articles:

Alvares, C. (1992) *Science, Development and Violence: The Revolt against Modernity*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, L. (1998) 'Contextualizing Philanthropy in South Asia: A Textual Analysis of Sanskrit Sources', in W. F. Ilchman, S. N. Katz, and E. L. Queen II (eds) *Philanthropy in the World's Tradition*, pp. 57-78. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Appadurai, A. (1996) *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Arjomand, S. A. (1998) 'Philanthropy, the Law, and Public Policy in the Islamic World before the Modern Era', in W. F. Ilchman, S. N. Katz, and E. L. Queen II (eds) *Philanthropy in the World's Tradition*, pp.109-32. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Bain & Co. (2017) 'India Philanthropy Report: The Individual Philanthropist's Path to Full Potential'. New Delhi: Bain & Co., Inc.

Bain & Co. (2015) 'India Philanthropy Report: Accelerating the Next Philanthropic Wave'. New Delhi: Bain & Co., Inc.

Bishop, M. and M. Green (2008) *Philanthrocapitalism: How the Rich Can Save the World and Why We Should Let Them*. London: A&C Black.

Blake, S., T. Chand, N. Dutta, A. Fradd and G. Gupta. (2009) 'Giving in India: A Guide for Funders and Charities'. London: New Philanthropy Capital.

Bornsetin, E. (2009) 'The Impulse of Philanthropy', *Cultural Anthropology* 24(4): 622–51.

Bukhari, A. (2013) 'Philanthropy in India Today'. *Alliance* 18(2): 47-50.

Cantegreil, M., D. Chanana and R. Kattumuri (eds) (2013) *Revealing Indian Philanthropy*. London: Alliance Publishing Trust.

Chakrabarty, B. (2015) 'Universal Benefit: Gandhi's Doctrine of Trusteeship: A Review Article', *Modern Asian Studies* 49(2): 572-608.

Chatterjee, P. (1993) *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Chowdhury, I. (2012) 'The Laboratory and its Double: The Making of the Scientist-Citizen at TIFR'. CASI Working Paper Series, 12-01. Philadelphia: Center for the Advanced Study of India, University of Pennsylvania,

Chowdhury, I. and A. Dasgupta (2010) *A Masterful Spirit: Homi Bhabha, 1909-1966*. Delhi: Penguin India.

Coutts & Co. (2015) 'Million Dollar Donor Report 2015.' Available online at http://philanthropy.coutts.com/en/reports/2015/executive-summary.html; accessed June 20, 2016.

Desai, A. V. (1968) 'The Origins of Parsi Enterprise', *Indian Economic and Social History Review* 5(4): 307-17.

Edwards, M. (2008) *Just Another Emperor?: The Myths and Realities of Philanthrocapitalism*. New York: Demos.

Ensminger, D. (1972) *Rural India in Transition*. New Delhi: All India Panchayat Parishad.

Gordon, L. A. (1997) 'Wealth Equals Wisdom? The Rockefeller and Ford Foundations in India', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 554: 104-116.

Harris, F. R. (1925) *Jamsetji Nusserwanji Tata: A Chronicle of his Life*. London: Oxford University Press.

Harris, F. R. (1958) *Jamsetji Nusserwanji Tata: A Chronicle of his Life*. 2nd edition. Bombay: Blackie and Sons

Haynes, D. E. (1987) 'From Tribute to Philanthropy: The Politics of Gift Giving in a Western Indian City', *Journal of Asian Studies* 46(2): 339-60.

Hess, G. R. (2003) 'Waging the Cold War in the Third World: The Foundations and the Challenges of Development', in L. F. Friedman and M. D. McGarvie (eds) *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*, pp. 319-339. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hess, G. R. (2005) 'The Role of American Philanthropic Foundations in India's Road to Globalization during the Cold War Era', in S. Hewa and D. H. Stapleton (eds) *Globalization, Philanthropy, and Civil Society: Toward a New Political Culture in the Twenty first Century*, pp. 51-72. New York: Springer.

Holmes, G., 2012. 'Biodiversity for Billionaires: Capitalism, Conservation and the Role of Philanthropy in Saving/Selling Nature', *Development and Change* 43(1): 185-203.

Howe, B. (1980) 'The Emergence of Scientific Philanthropy, 1900-1920: Origins, Issues and Outcomes', in R. F. Arnove (ed) *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad*, pp. 25-54. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Inderfurth, K. F. and P. Khambatta (2012) 'Bridging the Gap? New Philanthropy in India'. *US-India Insight* 2(5). Washington DC: Centre for Strategic and International Studies.

Juergensmeyer, M. and McMahon, D. M. (1998) 'Hindu Philanthropy and Civil Society', in W. Ilchman, S. Katz, and E. L. Queen II (eds), *Philanthropy in the World's Tradition*s. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Karaka, D. F. (1884) *History of the Parsis Including their Manners, Customs, Religion, and Present Position*, vol II. London: Macmillan.

Kassam, M., F. Handy and E. Jansons (2016) *Philanthropy in India: Promise to Practice.* New Delhi: Sage.

Kavadi, S. N. (2014) 'Lady Tata Memorial Trust and Leukaemia Research in Europe, 1932-53', *Economic and Political Weekly* 49(45): 69-74.

Kohler, R. E. (1991) *Partners in Science: Foundations and Natural Scientists 1900-1945*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kudaisya, M. (2003) *The Life and Times of G. D. Birla*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Lala, R. M. (1984) *The Heartbeat of a Trust: Fifty Years of the Sir Dorabji Tata Trust*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill.

Lala, R. M. (2004) *Creation of Wealth*. New Delhi: Viking.

Lala, R. M. (2006) *For the Love of India: The Life and Times of Jamsetji Tata*. New Delhi: Penguin Books.

Landim, L. and A. Thompson (1999) 'Non-governmental organizations and philanthropy in Latin America: An overview'. *Voluntas* 8(4): 337-350.

Luhrmann, T. M. (1996) *The Good Parsi: The Fate of a Colonial Elite in a Postcolonial Society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mangaleswaran R. and R. Ventakaraman (nd) 'Designing Indian Philanthropy for Impact'. *Voices, McKinsey on Society*, http://voices.mckinseyonsociety.com/india-philanthropy-impact/ (accessed 28 September 2016).

Markovits, C. (1996) 'The Tata Paradox', in B. Stein and S. Subrahmanyam (eds), *Institutions and Economic Change in South Asia*, pp. 237–48. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Markovits, C. (2008) *Merchants, Traders, Entrepreneurs: Indian Business in the Colonial Era*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

McRobie, G. (1979) 'Intermediate Technology: Small is Successful', *Third World Quarterly* 1(2): 71-86.

Morvaridi, B. (2012) 'Capitalist Philanthropy and Hegemonic Partnerships', *Third World Quarterly* 33(7): 1191-210.

Mukherjee, S. (2009) 'New Province, Old Capital: Making Patna Pataliputra', *Indian Economic Social History Review* 46(2): 241-79.

Norton, M. and M. Culshaw. (2000) *Getting Started in Fundraising*. Sage, New Delhi.

Nye. J.S. (1990) 'Soft power', *Foreign Policy* 80: 153-171.

Palsetia, J. S. (2001) *The Parsis of India: Preservation of Identity in Bombay City*. Leiden: Brill.

Palsetia, J. S. (2003) '"Honourable Machinations": The Jamsetjee Jejeebhoy Baronetcy and the Indian Response to the Honours System in India', *South Asia Research* 23(1): 55-75.

Palsetia, J. S. (2005) 'Merchant Charity and Public Identity Formation in Colonial India: The Case of Jamsetjee Jejeebhoy', *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 40(3): 197-217.

Parmar, I. (2012) *Foundations of the America Century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American power.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Payton, R. L. and M. P. Moody (2008) *Understanding Philanthropy: Its Meaning and Mission*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Pletsch, C. E. (1981) 'The Three Worlds, or the Division of Social Scientific Labor, circa 1950-1975', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 23(4): 565-590.

Prakash, G. (1999) *Another Reason: Science and the Imagination of Modern India.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ramanathan, M. and B. V. Subbarayappa (2011) 'Indian Institute of Science: Its Origin and Growth, c. 1909-1947', in U. Das Gupta (ed) *Science and Modern India: An Institutional History, c. 1784-1947*, pp. 871-926. New Delhi: Pearson Longman.

Ramdas, K. N. (2011) Philanthrocapitalism is not social change philanthropy. *Stanford Social Innovation Review Blog.* https://ssir.org/point_counterpoint/philanthrocapitalism (accessed 9 December 2016).

Richey, L. A. and S. Ponte (2014) 'New Actors and Alliances in Development', *Third World Quarterly* 35(1): 1-21.

Schumacher, E. F. (1973) *Small is Beautiful: A Study of Economics as if People Mattered.* London: Blond and Briggs.

Sebaly, K. P. (1985) 'The Tatas and University Reform in India, 1898-1914', *History Of Education* 14(2): 117-36.

Seth, S. (1993) '"Nehruvian Socialism", 1927-1937: Nationalism, Marxism, and the Pursuit of Modernity', *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 18(4): 453-73.

Shiva, V. (1989) *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Development.* London: Zed Books.

Sidel, M. (2001) 'Recent Research on Philanthropy and the Nonprofit Sector in India and South Asia', *Voluntas* 12(2): 171-80.

Staples, E. S. (1992) *Forty Years: A Learning Curve. The Ford Foundation Programs in India 1952-1992*. New Delhi: The Ford Foundation.

Subbarayappa, B. V. (1992) *In Pursuit of Excellence: A History of the Indian Institute of Science*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

Sundar, P. (2000) *Beyond Business: From Merchant Charity to Corporate Citizenship, Indian Business Philanthropy Through the Ages*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing.

Sundar, P. (2013) *Business and Community: The Story of Corporate Social Responsibility in India.* New Delhi: Sage.

Tripathi, D. (2014) 'Book review: Business and society: The story of corporate social responsibility in India', *Journal of Entrepreneurship* 23(2): 334-7.

Tripathi, D. and J. Jumani. (2007) *The Concise Oxford History of Indian Business*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Tripathi, D. and M. Mehta. (1990) *Business Houses in Western India: A Study in Entrepreneurial Response.* Delhi: Manohar.

Truman, H. S. (1949) 'Inaugural Presidential Address', Harry S Truman Library and Musuem. https://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/50yr_archive/inagural20jan1949.htm (accessed 30 November 2015).

Wallerstein, I. (1997) 'The Unintended Consequences of Cold War Area Studies', in N. Chmosky (ed) *The Cold War and the University: Toward an Intellectual History ofthe Postwar Years*, pp. 195-231, New York: New Press.

White, D. L. (1991) 'From Crisis to Community Definition: The Dynamics of Eighteenth Century Parsi Philanthropy', *Modern Asian Studies* 25(2): 303-20.

World Bank (nd) Net ODA Received (% of GNI). http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/DT.ODA.ODAT.GN.ZS?end=2015&locations=IN&start=1960&view=chart (accessed 13 June 2017).

Unpublished Theses:

Kavadi, S. N. (2011) 'State Policy, Philanthropy, and Medical Research in Western India, 1898-1962'. PhD Thesis in History. Asiatic Society of Mumbai, Mumbai.